



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/810,267

03/26/2004

Andrew Kapochunas

384.7817USU

8528

7590

06/20/2006

Paul D. Greeley, Esq.
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
10th Floor
One Landmark Square
Stamford, CT 06901-2682

EXAMINER

PARDO, THUY N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,267

Applicant(s)

KAPOCHUNAS ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy Pardo

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on March 30, 2006 in response to Examiner's Office Action has been reviewed.
2. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Clark et al. (Hereinafter "Clark") US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0153663.

As to claim 1, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising:
receiving at least one input address [obtain street address information, 10 of fig. 1; 0040;
comparing said at least one input address to at least one standard [compare to old street
address or a reference address, 12 of fig. 1; 22-80 of fig. 2; 0041]; and
providing a single best address derived from said at least one input address based on said
comparison [update address file, 84 of fig. 2].

As to claim 2, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches matching said single best address to a database having unique business identifiers associated with addresses to find a matching address and providing said matching address [0032-0034; 0043].

As to claim 3, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said database is an advanced office system (AOS) [0041].

As to claim 4, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches providing a match project analysis report [0290; 0296; 0301].

As to claim 5, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches converting said at least one input address to a predetermined record layout, before comparing said input address to said at least one standard [30-80 of fig. 2].

As to claim 6, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches associating said at least one input address with at least one code, said code being used to determine said single best address [0051-0081; 0094-0103].

As to claim 7, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches associating said at least one input address with at least one score, said score being used to determine said single best address [0222-0223; fig. 19-15].

As to claim 8, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said at least one standard is at least one selected from the group consisting of: ZIP+4 coding, coding accuracy support system (CASS), Locatable Address Conversion System (LACS), delivery sequence file (DSF), and National Change of Address (NCOA) [0041-0042].

As to claim 13, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches a matcher for attempting to match any address in said output file or said invalid records to a matching address in a database having unique business identifiers associated with addresses [0023-0030].

As to claim 14, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches an investigator for investigating any address not matched, upon request [0031; 0036].

As to claim 15, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said pre-auditor calculates a plurality of counts associated with said input address file [0010; 0031].

As to claim 16, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said input address file includes a plurality of records and each record includes a plurality of fields [0088-0216].

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 17, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said count is at least one selected from the group consisting of: a number of distinct values by field, a missing field count, a total number of records, and a percent of distinct values [missing field count, 0129-0136; 0150-0153].

As to claim 18, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said view is at least one selected from the group consisting of: alphabetical, most frequent content, and alpha characters only [0032-0034; 0036].

As to claims 9, 10-12 and 19-21, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on March 30, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Clark does not disclose or suggest comparing the new address and the reference address to produce a "best address" derived from the two addresses.

As to this point, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the Specification. Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is

Art Unit: 2165

justified. See *In re prater*, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969). In this case, Examiner believes that Clark teaches all such features. Clark teaches comparing street address information obtained from the user to the old street address or reference address [0041; 12 of fig. 1; 22-80 of fig. 2], and then updating address file [see 84 of fig. 2]. Although Clark does not use exactly the word “providing a single best address”, Clark performs updating address file based on the addresses comparison. The step of “updating the address information” constitutes “providing a best address information” as the Examiner understands the phrase “providing a best address information”.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2165

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo, whose telephone number is 571-272-4082. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin, can be reached at 571-272-4146.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned as follows:

571-273-8300 (Official Communication)

and/or:

571-273-4082 (*Use this Fax#, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "Draft" communication. Examiner may request that a formal/amendment be faxed directly to then on occasions).*

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 16, 2006



**THUY N. PARDO
PRIMARY EXAMINER**